

volte la provenienza locale è accertata. Per quanto riguarda la reatina n. 25, potrebbe essere rivendicata a Roma solo se ci fossero altre prove solide, quali l'aspetto esteriore del supporto; ma qui esse mancano, per cui non riterrei l'iscrizione senz'altro urbana. E nel caso di Reate n. 28 manca ogni argomento per una sua provenienza urbana. Si aggiunga ancora che queste due iscrizioni sono entrate nel museo solo verso la fine del '900 e non furono mai viste prima, per cui non sarà facile ammettere che ancora ai nostri giorni epigrafi urbane siano entrate nel museo di Rieti senza che se ne conservasse alcuna memoria. Quello che era possibile nei secoli passati, non lo è più di recente. – Ekkehard Weber tratta il problema dei falsi alla luce di alcuni casi concreti, ma non in modo sistematico. Anche questo problema dei falsi meriterebbe di essere trattato a fondo nel quadro di un colloquio. Per quanto riguarda *CIL* I² 1211 (non 1007), escludo assolutamente la possibilità di una falsificazione (le considerazioni addotte da Weber non sono convincenti). Non vedo neanche argomenti probanti che possano condurci a relegare tra i falsi l'epitaffio di un soldato della coorte dei Batavi milliaria edito in *CIL* III 3676.

Heikki Solin

Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie 19. Edizioni Quasar, Roma 2002. ISBN 88-7140-212-X. 322 pp. EUR 46,48.

This volume of the by now well-established epigraphical series *Supplementa Italica*, meant to update older publications (especially the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*) by editing the inscriptions published subsequently to the *Corpus* and by furnishing a historical introduction and addenda to the "older" texts (not reproduced in the volumes), contains the following cities: Interamna Nahars in Umbria, by C. Andreani and M. Fora; 35 new texts); Pollentia and Augusta Bagiennorum in Liguria, both by G. Mennella and E. Bernardini (Pollentia with 36 new texts, Augusta with 13); and Vercellae (with "Inter Vercellas et Eporediam") by S. Giorcelli Bersani (35 new texts). This is now the 12th Ligurian contribution of Mennella, and, as Silvio Panciera observes in the *presentazione* (p. 8) – a traditional part of a *Supplementum* volume always with interesting observations – , since other contributors have also been dealing with Liguria, this means that the coverage of Liguria is nearing its completion. The same cannot be said of other Italian regions, but at least one can say that there is steady progress, as the publication of the *Suppl. It.* volumes has kept its planned pace of about one volume per year. I doubt whether many really thought in the beginning (in the early 80s) that this would actually be the case.

Again, the contributions are of great interest; as always, one must take into account not only the epigraphical parts but also the historical introductions which are normally of great use and often supersede earlier discussions of a certain city's vicissitudes. In this volume, I found the introduction to Interamna most instructive. It is a city which plays an interesting role, especially in the first century BC (the other cities dealt with here are historically less interesting, although Vercellae managed to get its name attached to a battle and although the cities all supplied a number of men to Rome's

military forces). As for the addenda to the inscriptions already in the *Corpus*, these are also of great use, as one finds here references to modern bibliography (although one wonders if this information has to be as complete as to include notes on erroneous readings of a certain inscription by persons clearly outside the field of epigraphical studies – note, e.g., the readings of a certain P. Renzi adduced at Internamna no. 4209), information on the physical features and on the whereabouts of the stones, etc. Here, too, readers of this book will probably concentrate on the addenda to Interamna, as there are a number of well-known texts from this city. And there is, in fact, much of interest and of use. No. 4172 (*ILS* 3052), mentioning Rustii with the cognomen *Caepio*, might be used in determining the origin of the senatorial Rustii Caepiones; however, although a paper is quoted in which I suggest this possibility, the authors do not seem to take a clear stand on this question. – No. 4179, a not at all unproblematic text, mentions senators, clearly local, called Arruntius; and a woman who seems to be the daughter of a *C. Africanus*; Africanus Fabius Maximus cos. 10 BC is adduced here for illustration, but I very much doubt whether this person, a patrician, could be of any service. – In no. 4183a, some works dealing with the "gens Aufidia, di origine sabellica" (not a very helpful observation) are referred to, but not the monograph of N. Mathieu, *Histoire d'un nom: les Aufidii dans la vie politique, économique et sociale du monde romain*, (Rennes, 1999). – On no. 4206 (*ILS* 5645), note the interpretation of the term *muliebria aeramenta* (convincing, I think). – On no. 4213 (*CIL* I² 2510; *ILS* 6629), the inscription honouring a certain A. Pompeius A. f. Clu., a senator clearly belonging to the famous *gens* and thus not a local man, the editors follow those scholars who suggest that the inscription should be dated to the early Augustan period, the *pericula* referring to something happening after the *bellum Perusinum*. This is no doubt a good solution.

Among the "new" texts (many of them not previously published or published only in journals of a more local character), there are some items of interest. For instance, there are new praetorians in nos. 4 and 5, a certain *Thalamus Aug. l. a veste* in no. 6 (none of these three texts in the *AE*). As for onomastics, note the nomen *Detelius* in no. 14 (according to the commentary, the first instance in Umbria). No. 3 (*AE* 1996, 603, in honour of the equestrian [Vol]usius Volusianus) is an inscription with some striking formulations. We now read, after the mention of the honorand, *[fabr?]i qui sub aede / [Intera]mna conveniunt*, which does not seem very satisfactory; certainly I cannot be the only one to miss a definition of the *aedes* (*[Intera]mna* is no doubt to be understood as an ablative representing the locative). Now the *ordinatio* of the text (especially that in line 2) seems to indicate that more is missing on the left than is indicated in the reconstruction here, and thus it seems possible to assume that the name of a deity should be supplied at the beginning of line 4 (in line 5, one could then add, e.g., *multa*, in line 6 *eius*). – "Sensi 1999", cited on p. 115, does not seem to appear in the bibliography.

In the contribution on Pollentia, the most interesting new text may well be no. 8, a fragment brilliantly elucidated by G. Mennella and thus turning out to be part of an inscription in honour of Lollianus Avitus cos. 144, thought to come from Pollentia. One also observes a *merkator vinarius* (10, = *AE* 1960, 284). No. 20 (*AE* 1998, 532), enumerating members of a family of Vennii, which is interesting inasmuch the eldest has the cognomen *Super*, confirming once again the interpretation of this cognomen by Schulze (*Eigennamen* 499 n. 1). This inscription also provides a new instance of a family

in which some, but not all, sons have the same praenomen, Super and Quartus being Gaii, Secundus a Lucius. As both Super and Quartus are designated as *v(ivi)*, this cannot be explained by the fact that Quartus was born after Super's death. I cannot explain this use of praenomina (for one would expect all sons in a family to have either different praenomina or the same praenomen) but may be allowed to point out that I collected some parallel cases in *Die römischen Vornamen* 386f.

In the contribution on Vercellae, there is (p. 295f.) a useful treatment of the *lex Tappula* (ILS 8761) and a new edition of the bilingual (Latin/Celtic) inscription recording the *finis* of a *campus* (CIL I² 3403a; "Lejeune, 1988", cited as an authority for the reading of lines 9–12, does not seem to appear in the bibliography; the same could be said of "Salomies, 1987", cited, perhaps not for a very good reason, as an authority on double filiations in the Cisalpina on p. 313).

I must conclude by stressing once again the importance of the contributions included here and of the series *Supplementa Italica* in general. I am also happy to be able to observe that there is constant progress; vol. 20 already exists and the preparation of vols. 21 and 22 is referred to in the *Presentazione* on p. 8.

Olli Salomies

ALFONS ZETTLER: *Offerenteninschriften auf den frühchristlichen Mosaikfußböden Venetiens und Istriens. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 26. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 2001. ISBN 3-11-016261-X. IX, 306 S., 321 abb., 16 Taf. EUR 128.

Das Buch enthält eine lange Analyse von Offerenteninschriften, eingebettet in ihren archäologisch-topographischen Kontext, gefolgt vom Corpus der betreffenden Inschriften. Das 2001 erschienene Werk nimmt keinerlei Rücksicht auf das 1993 publizierte Buch von J. P. Caillet über dasselbe Thema (Caillets Werk wird nur im Vorwort erwähnt). Aber im Zeitalter des Computers wäre es nicht schwierig gewesen, wenigstens Verweise auf Caillet vorzunehmen. Auch sonst hat Z. neuere Literatur aus den neunziger Jahren weitgehend unbeachtet gelassen. Zu bedauern ist, daß Brusins Corpus der Inschriften von Aquileia nicht ausgewertet wurde; desgleichen fehlt jeder Verweis auf wichtige in den *Supplementa Italica* erschienene Beiträge (etwa Inschrifteneditionen von Tergeste und Iulium Carnicum). – Z. will sich auf Venetien und Histrien konzentrieren. Was machen denn da Inschriften einerseits aus Florenz, andererseits aus den Donauprovinzen, etwa aus Celeia, Iuenna oder Stojnik? Die Orte werden in alphabetischer Folge dargeboten, was Zusammengehörendes auseinanderreißt (z. B. Aquileia und Grado). – Die Texte werden in Majuskelbuchstaben und ohne moderne Interpunktion und ohne jegliche Erklärungen geboten, was den Zugang zu ihrem Verständnis gewiß beträchtlich erschwert. Schon die erste Inschrift auf S. 166 wird mit einer bloßen Majuskeltranskription wiedergegeben, und der Leser muß mühsam mit Hilfe des Index (unter Theodor, Bf.) im ersten Teil des Buches suchen, um mit der Interpretation des schwierigen Textes zurechtzukommen. – Auch sonst gibt die Wiedergabe des Inschriftentextes Anlaß zu Kritik: vor allem werden falsche Namen